

**STRATEGIC PREVENTION FRAMEWORK STATE INCENTIVE GRANT
(SPF SIG)**

Evaluation Workgroup

May 22, 2007

MINUTES

PRESENT: Bob Levy, Chair
Eric Wright
Rebecca Smith
Harold Kooreman
Ruth Gassman
Jeff Barber
Gary Williams

DMHA STAFF: Marcia French
Kim Manlove

Call to Order

Bob Levy called the meeting to order and the minutes of March and April were approved.

Updates Reports

- A. **SEOW Report** – Eric Wright reported that the IPRC presented to the SEOW a comparison of IPRC and YRBS surveys. It was announced that the surveys will begin being given every other year to relieve the burden placed on students and schools. Eric also discussed the recommendation that came out of the SEOW meeting to bring to the legislature a collaborative voice from the governmental agencies to push for the participation of all schools in providing data. It was pointed out that a single unified data collection effort would provide better data quality, reduce the burden on schools and students, and allow the use of random sampling procedures. He mentioned that he was active in the Health Care Reformation and this would be a beneficial tool to piggy-back on that effort as well. The Workgroup was supportive about the possibilities that could result from this effort and offered to assist in any way possible.
- B. **SPF SIG Rollout Updates** - Marcia stated that the staff was up-to-date on the rollout of the project. All contract negotiations were completed one week early to allow for the maximum time possible for the contracts to be turned around in the Department of Administration. All contracts with the communities with the exception of one were signed on with the IPRC for technical assistance in assessment and evaluation. The funds to cover the TA from the IPRC were held out of the funds being given to each community and will be paid from one contract to the IPRC rather than having 11 different contracts. Vigo County opted to contract with their local college for the technical assistance. Concerns were voiced to make sure the college provided the same services that were being provided by the IPRC. Marcia stated this was addressed and stated in contract negotiations. Kim is working with Vigo County and will follow-up with finding out who the community plans to have do the TA from ISU. Marcia reported amounts and revisions for budgets were also done and have

been submitted by those communities being funded. All contracts, with the exception of ICJI are now waiting to be completed and are at DOA. ICJI is not contracted nor do they have an MOU ready due to not getting their MOU to DMHA until after contract negotiations were completed. DMHA and the SPF SIG staff have worked on identifying areas where a MOU could be utilized and will report out when those negotiations are completed.

- C. **Training/Outreach Update** - Marcia reported that Paula was anticipating a meeting with all the communities and to follow-up on the readiness assessment tool submitted with the applications but when the negotiations were moved up was already scheduled for those dates. It was decided that the teams established to meet with each community, (Northern Communities team: Marcia French, Eric Wright, Jeannie Alter and Eric Martin, and the Southern Communities team: Kim Manlove, Harold Kooreman, Jeanie Alter and Eric Martin) will instead go to meet with their communities and allow them to share with the team their perspective on where they are and what they are doing. The teams will then meet to do a community analysis and re-visit the communities to establishing benchmark dates and a strategic plan for working through the planning phase. The T/O workgroup also discussed and submitted and were accepted to do 4 conference sessions for the MVOV conference on August 1 and 2. The sessions representing the SPF process are inclusive of the logic model, developing missions, strategic planning and cultural competency. The next newsletters will be focused on the basics of the SPF processes.

D. **Process Evaluation**

Harold shared that the process and needs assessment for planning forms are in the process of being updated with the user manual. The recommendation is to have the Process/Needs Assessment for Planning ready by July 1st. Harold is reviewing documents now to use in creating this form. The Program/Implementation Surveys are tentatively scheduled to be ready by January 1st for review.

E. **Revisions for Workgroup Meeting Evaluations**

Harold discussed the process assessment of each individual community. WesStat (one of the federal evaluators) has developed a series of instruments which the state evaluators are now required to use for rating funded communities. The instruments help evaluators assign scores to each SPF step. The scores are assigned based on reviews of strategic plans, discussions with local evaluators, the CLI, and other pertinent material such as meeting minutes, budgets, etc. The scoring is to be done annually with the first scores being submitted once a community has completed its strategic plan and the remaining scores being submitted 6 months post implementation of the plan. WesStat will create a web-based data submission form for us to use. Additionally, the state evaluators are planning to complete case studies of each funded community which describes their unique experiences with the SPF process. Data for the case studies will come from information gathered during site visits, from CLIs, meeting minutes, and any other data which is collected from communities.

Harold discussed reducing the number of items on the meeting evaluation form. Trying to use the factor analysis to reduce items was not very effective as there was not enough data during early meetings to generate a satisfactory factor structure that reflected all aspects of the meeting form. It was suggested and agreed upon by the group that Harold should select between 5-10 items that best reflect the areas of cooperation, quality, participation, etc., that the workgroup thought should be measured.

F. Annual Satisfaction Survey

The draft of the annual satisfaction survey of the SPF-SIG process was discussed. The questionnaire was developed using approximately 12 questions from the State-Level Instrument and additional questions developed by Eric and me as well as questions from another organizational satisfaction survey to which we had access. The survey will be posted on line and will be completed by all individuals involved in the planning and implementation of the SPF to date. Communities will not be asked to complete the survey. The survey is more for a state-level satisfaction assessment.

Bob asked what the direction of the GAC would be for the future. Kim stated that he was scheduling appointments to meet with each chair to get some input from them on what their ideas are. Some ideas were floated and Kim will follow up.

G. IPRC Evaluation Update

Ruth shared that IPRC will be hiring 6 new employees. Three will be devoted to the efforts of evaluation and three will be targeted for assessment technical assistance. Jeanie Alter will be overseeing the evaluation and Eric Martin will take the lead on assessment TA. Efforts will be made to identify persons in different regions of Indiana to cut-down on the travel. Ruth anticipates her staff being in the communities at least every week. Jeannie will be joining the Evaluation Workgroup in June.

New Business and next meeting

The next meeting will be held on June 12th at 10:30a. Marcia is to schedule a room and will email the information of where the next meeting is along with the Evaluation Protocol to review.

Next meeting will be an in-depth discussion on

- Evaluation protocol for the state level

Adjourned.

